

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated March 12, 2007 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for courtesies extended during an interview with Applicant's representatives on April 5, 2007. During the interview, the claims were discussed and the prior art reviewed. See Interview Summary dated April 5, 2007. This Amendment and Response is believed to be responsive to the interview and is believed to address the Examiner's rejections.

Claims 1-5 are rejected by the Examiner. With this response, claim 1 has been amended, and new claims 23-25 have been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-25 are currently pending in this application with claims 6-22 having been withdrawn.

In the Office Action, claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,969,718 to Noguchi et al. (hereinafter "Noguchi"). Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noguchi in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,327,008 to Fujiyoshi (hereinafter "Fujiyoshi").

The rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Noguchi is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Applicant submits that Noguchi does not disclose each and every element of the claims.

Claim 5 recites a liquid crystal display device having a combination of features including "a first pixel electrode adjacent to each of the first and second data lines and spaced at a predetermined distance from the first data line; and a second pixel electrode adjacent to each of the second and third data lines and spaced apart from the second data line by a distance different from said distance between the first data line and the first pixel electrode, wherein the second pixel electrode has a larger dimension than the first pixel electrode, and wherein a parasitic capacitance between the second pixel electrode and the second data line is at least three times greater than a parasitic capacitance between the first pixel electrode and the first data line."

The Examiner in rejecting claim 5 cites FIG 5A of Noguchi. In particular, the Examiner identifies elements 513 and 514 of FIG. 5A as the first and second data lines and identifies elements 522 and 517 as the first and second pixel electrodes, respectively. Applicant submits that the elements identified by the Examiner are not arranged as recited in claim 5. For example, element 522 is not “adjacent to each of the second and third data lines.” Accordingly, Applicant submits that Noguchi does not anticipate claim 5.

Applicant additionally submits that Noguchi does not teach “wherein a parasitic capacitance between the second pixel electrode and the second data line is at least three times greater than a parasitic capacitance between the first pixel electrode and the first data line” as recited in claim 5. Applicant notes Noguchi does not explicitly disclose the values of parasitic capacitance between pixels and data lines, and the Examiner relies on an observation that “the distance between the second pixel and the second data line is shorter than that between the first pixel and the first data line.” The Examiner concludes from this observation that for the first and second pixels identified by the Examiner in Noguchi, that inherently “a parasitic capacitance between the second pixel electrode and the second data line is at least three times greater than a parasitic capacitance between the first pixel electrode and the first data line.” Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s conclusion.

Applicant notes from FIG. 5A of Noguchi that the distance between the first sub pixel 522 and the first data line 513 is greater than that of the distance between the second pixel 517 and the second data line 525 because of the additional conductive sub pixel occupying the majority of the space between the first sub pixel 522 and the first data line. Applicant submits that because a conductive pixel material would not have the same permittivity ( $\epsilon$ ) as the insulating dielectric material separating the second pixel and the second data line, the respective parasitic capacitance between the second pixel and the second data line of Noguchi cannot be established to be “at least three times greater than a parasitic capacitance between the first pixel electrode and the first data line” as recited in claim 5 by merely comparing the respective distances between the data line and pixel electrode as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant submits that Noguchi does not anticipate claim 5 for at least this additional reason.

The rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being as being unpatentable over Noguchi in view of Fujiyoshi is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Applicant submits that the cited references including Noguchi and Fujiyoshi, analyzed singly or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element of the claims.

Claims 1-4 each recite a liquid crystal display device having a combination of features including “a second pixel electrode adjacent to each of the second and third data lines within a second pixel and spaced apart from the second data line by a distance different from said distance between the first data line and the first pixel electrode, wherein the second pixel is horizontally adjacent to the first pixel, and wherein a parasitic capacitance between the second pixel electrode and the second data line is about three times greater than a parasitic capacitance between the first pixel electrode and the first data line.”

The Examiner in rejecting claim 5 cites FIG 5A of Noguchi identifying elements 513 and 514 as the first and second data lines, and elements 522 and 517 as the first and second pixel electrodes, respectively. Applicant submits that the elements identified by the Examiner are not taught or suggested by Noguchi to be as recited in claim 5. For example, element 522 is not “adjacent to each of the first and second data lines” as an additional electrode is interposed between element 522 and data line 513. Additionally, Noguchi does not disclose, “the second pixel is horizontally adjacent to the first pixel” as recited in claim 1. Applicant notes that in FIG. 5A of Noguchi, pixels 517 and the sub pixels 522 are on different horizontal rows. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Noguchi does not teach or suggest at least the above-identified elements of claim 1-4.

Applicant further submits that for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 5, Noguchi does not teach or suggest “wherein a parasitic capacitance between the second pixel electrode and the second data line is about three times greater than a parasitic capacitance between the first pixel electrode and the first data line.” Applicant submits that claims Noguchi does not teach or suggest at least this additional combination of features of claims 1-4.

The Examiner cites Fujiyoshi as allegedly curing the deficiencies in the teaching of Noguchi. Applicant does not reach the Examiner’s conclusion regarding the teachings of Noguchi. Applicant submits that Noguchi and Fujiyoshi, analyzed separately or in any combination, do not teach at least the combined features recited in claims 1-4 and identified

above. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 1-4 are each allowable over Noguchi and Fujiyoshi.

Applicant submits that claims 23-25 are allowable at least based on their dependencies from allowable claim 5.

Applicant believes the foregoing remarks and amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 26, 2007

By Valerie P. Hayes  
Valerie P. Hayes  
Registration No. 53,005  
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant